

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
WHEELING**

MAURICE GOLSTON,

Petitioner,

v.

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:19-CV-216
(BAILEY)**

MR. ENTZEL, Warden,
FCI Hazelton WV,

Respondent.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On this day, the above-styled matter came before this Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James P. Mazzone [Doc. 7]. Pursuant to this Court's Local Rules, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Mazzone for submission of a proposed report and recommendation ("R&R"). Magistrate Judge Mazzone filed his R&R on September 30, 2019, wherein he recommends that petitioner's Petition for Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1] be dismissed without prejudice.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Snyder v.*

Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Mazzone's R&R were due within fourteen (14) days of service, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). On October 23, 2019, petitioner filed a letter stating he needed an extension which this Court construed as a Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to the Report and Recommendation [Doc. 9]. On October 24, 2019, this Court granted the motion and gave petitioner twenty-one (21) days from receipt of that Order to file objections. [Doc. 10]. Service of that Order was accepted on October 31, 2019. Accordingly, petitioner had until November 21, 2019 to file objections to the R&R. To date, no objections have been filed. Accordingly, this Court will review the R&R for clear error.

Upon careful review of the above, it is the opinion of this Court that the Report and Recommendation [Doc. 7] should be, and is, hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's report. Accordingly, petitioner's Petition for Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1] is hereby **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. This Court further **ORDERS** that this matter be **STRICKEN** from the active docket of this Court and **DIRECTS** the Clerk to enter judgment in favor of respondent.

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record herein and to mail a copy to the *pro se* petitioner.

DATED: December 2, 2019.



JOHN PRESTON BAILEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE